



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/409,986	09/30/1999	GHASSAN NAIM	71493-576	6209

7590 05/05/2004

DOWELL & DOWELL PC
1215 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
SUITE 309
ARLINGTON, VA 222023124

EXAMINER

CRAVER, CHARLES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2682	5

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

<i>APR</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/409,986	NAIM ET AL.
	Examiner Charles R Craver	Art Unit 2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2002.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 24 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,11,12 and 18-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 6-10 and 13-17 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
|--|--|

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 12, 18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tiedemann.

Claim 1: Tiedemann discloses a method for selecting one of a number of wireless stations (FIG 1) to be allocated a transmit opportunity, comprising selecting a group of stations to compete for a communication opportunity (col 4 line 60-col 5 line 15 and col 8 lines 43-65), for each station, maintaining a respective transaction length and delay for each station and computing a priority based on the length and delay (col 5 lines 16-25), and selecting a station with the highest priority to be allocated said opportunity (col 5 lines 25-26).

Claims 2 and 3: Tiedemann discloses that the method is applicable over both forward and reverse links (col 4 lines 60-66, col 14 lines 53-56). **Claim 5:** Tiedemann discloses station type priority as a factor (col 32 line 66-col 33 line 17). **Claim 12:**

Tiedemann discloses using a queue for data destined for the mobile station (col 21 lines 49-67). **Claim 18:** the invention of Tiedemann would inherently operate over both directions in a simultaneous fashion if two stations were communicating with each other. **Claim 19:** the reservation of transmission bandwidth for a station which is receiving forward link traffic would inherently occur if said station is at the top of the priority list for reverse link bandwidth allocation. **Claim 20:** Tiedemann discloses a scheduler (col 7 lines 28-39). **Claim 21:** Tiedemann discloses that the scheduling may be a part of a BS (col 8 lines 15-31). **Claim 22:** Tiedemann discloses that the scheduler may be a part of a BSC (col 6 lines 16-28, FIG 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiedemann.

Claim 11: While disclosing applicant's invention of claim 1 above, Tiedemann does not disclose a random selection if multiple stations have the same priority. However, given that a selection would need to be made, a random selection would have been a routine engineering decision, and as such one of ordinary skill in the art would

have found such an option obvious in view of the prior art. Such a selection would be the most fair approach.

Claim 23: while disclosing applicant=s invention of claim 1, Tiedemann does not disclose a MAC layer device. However, given that MAC layer devices were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention, the examiner takes Official Notice of such a feature, and asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have considered a MAC layer device for the operation of the scheduling, as it would follow a well known protocol and provide ease of installation in a cellular system.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 24 is allowed.
6. Claims 6-10 and 13-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 6 and 7 teach towards a method for prioritizing access to a system by competing radio stations, said priority being based on the length of expected communications and the amount of time since the stations=s last transmit opportunity, wherein further the priority is based on how long until a timeout will occur for that station. Claim 8 teaches that the priority is an increasing function of delay and a

Art Unit: 2682

decreasing function of transaction length. Claim 9 teaches that the priority is also an increasing function of wireless station priority. Claim 10 further teaches that the priority is also a decreasing function of said timeout.

Claim 13 teaches towards a method for prioritizing access to a system by competing radio stations, said priority being based on the length of expected communications and the amount of time since the stations=s last transmit opportunity, wherein further selection of the group of stations to compete includes, on the basis of the stations's rate, determining the next opportunity that the station should compete for, and selecting the group from among those that should compete.

Claim 14 teaches towards a method for prioritizing access to a system by competing radio stations, said priority being based on the length of expected communications and the amount of time since the stations=s last transmit opportunity, wherein further transmit units for the station are queued in a high or low priority queue, and the group of stations to compete are selected among those whose units are in the high priority queue, and if there are none, selecting among the low priority queue.

Claim 15 teaches towards a method for prioritizing access to a system by competing radio stations, said priority being based on the length of expected communications and the amount of time since the stations=s last transmit opportunity, wherein further the priority is calculated according to a specific formula $P=-1 (dFr+a)$, highest $(dFr=a)$, $(dFr/trSize)(1+[(1/a-dFr)-(1/a)]\%)+MSPriority (dFr,a)$.

Claim 16 teaches towards a method for prioritizing access to a system by competing radio stations, said priority being based on the length of expected

Art Unit: 2682

communications and the amount of time since the stations=s last transmit opportunity, wherein further the access to the system is via time slots, and a timeout value is set for each station, and if a timeout value is reserved, resetting the timeout to occur at a slot available for allocation before the reserved slot. Claim 17 teaches periodically reserving transmit opportunities for contention access by noncompeting stations those reserved opportunities being unavailable for allocation to competing stations.

Claim 24 teaches towards a method for prioritizing access to a system by competing radio stations, said priority being based on the length of expected communications and the amount of time since the stations=s last transmit opportunity, wherein further the system causes the station to compete with one another for a communication opportunity, and wherein the stations are wireless base stations.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10-3-02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding *Tiedemann*, the examiner upholds the rejections noted above. First, while the applicant asserts that the *Tiedemann* reference focuses on transmission from the perspective of a data packet as opposed to that of a BTS, such a distinction is not made in the instant claims. While the instant invention as detailed in the specification may utilize the delay metric in a different way than the *Tiedemann* reference (the time data is made available to the remote station to the time of transmission at a high data rate), the delay of *Tiedemann* is still read as indicating how long since the wireless

station last transmitted data including being allocated a transmit opportunity, as *Tiedemann* discloses that the delay may also be that already experienced by the user (e.g. since a last transmission) in col 33 lines 42-57. As such, since the specific delay technique and the BTS-oriented perspective are not recited in the rejected claim(s), they are not considered regarding patentability of the instant claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 2682

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 872-9314 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121
Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, sixth floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner

should be directed to Charles Craver whose telephone number is (703) 305-3965.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Ed Urban, can be reached on (703) 305-4385.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is
(703) 305-4700.

Cc

C. Craver

May 3, 2004

WU S/3/04
CHARLES CRAVER
PATENT EXAMINER